

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figure 3. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-8, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-8.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 26-45 are now pending in the application. Claims 16-25 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the new claims and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets," reference numeral 120 in Figure 3 has been modified as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and removal of the objection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16-19 and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that claims 16-25 have been cancelled, rendering the rejections under §112 moot.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND 103

Claims 18, 22 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Holzer, Jr. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,103,565, hereinafter "Holzer"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Langhoff (U.S. Pat. No. 5,306,025, hereinafter "Langhoff"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Wright (U.S. Pat. No. 5,433,457, hereinafter "Wright"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18, 22 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Atkinson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,033,251, hereinafter "Atkinson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 18, 19, 22, 23 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Beale (U.S. Pat. No. 3,977,287, hereinafter "Beale"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langhoff. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 19 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holzer in view of Tseng (U.S. Pat. No. 5,664,792, hereinafter "Tseng"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 19 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Langhoff in view of Tseng. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 19 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright in view of Tseng. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16, 17, 19-21, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Atkinson in view of Tseng. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claims 16-25 have been cancelled and claims 26-45 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Independent claims 26 and 37 claim "said angularly disposed edge section generally defining a reciprocating axis of said saw blade." The prior art fails to disclose an angularly disposed edge section as claimed, extending along the reciprocating axis of the saw blade, as claimed. As a result of this feature, as well as the other features set forth in the new claims, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug. 23, 2005

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWM/JMP